

Page 7 09/825,645 LUC-299/Bushnell 20-1

Remarks

Entry of the above-noted amendments, reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims pending are respectfully requested. Claims 1, 5, 11 and 15-17 remain pending.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter of claim 15 which is rewritten in independent format. It is also noted that claims 5 and 15 were not rejected based on any prior art grounds.

Applicant's arguments presented below focus on certain patentable differences between the invention as claimed and the applied references. However, it is not to be inferred that the failure to argue all differences between the claimed subject matter and the applied references constitutes acceptance of assertions made in the Office Action of alleged similarities between elements of the claimed subject matter and the applied references.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph:

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, relating to the phone being defined to comprise first and second phones, and the use of multiple switch components providing the shared call appearance. The claims are revised in such a manner that these issues will now be moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph:

Claims 11-17 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, relating primarily to the phone being defined to comprise first and second phones. The claims are revised in such a manner that these issues are now moot.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. 102:

Claims 1, 11, 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Gidwani (U.S. Patent No. 6,640,239). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102. The communication system of claim 1 includes first and second phones where the first and second phones are not connected to each other as extension phones. The switch component provides the first phone with a shared call appearance with the second phone through the packet network. A "shared call appearance" is well understood in the telecommunication field as meaning phones that share a common address, i.e. typically a common telephone number. Per claim 1 the switch component provides the first phone with a shared call appearance with the second phone through the packet network.

Claim 1 further recites that the path by which the second phone is coupled to the switch component is independent of the path by which the first phone is coupled to the switch component. This is not true for Gidwani where the multiple channels available at the customer premise side are all contained in one DSL line from the UIP Server; see FIG. 2 & 3.

Also, the registration server of claim 1 that supports the selectability of the telephone number by the user to be associated with the first phone is not taught by Gidwani.

Gidwani does not teach a system having the elements and functionality as defined by claim 1. Therefore, the rejection of claim 1 based on Gidwani should be withdrawn.

Independent method claim 11 is each believed to be allowable for similar reasons discussed for claim 1. Dependent claims 16 & 17 should be allowable as depending from an allowable parent claim.

Page 9 09/825,645 LUC-299/Bushnell 20-1

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in advancing the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Charles L. Warren", written over a horizontal line.

Charles L. Warren
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 27,407

Dated: August 20, 2006

CARMEN B. PATTI & ASSOCIATES, LLC
Customer Number 47382